

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-13 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 9-13 have been added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 presently stand rejected. Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging that, although currently objected to, claims 3, 5 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Taniguchi et al. (JP 401114822A). Additionally, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi et al. (JP 401114822A). For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests favorable disposition of the application.

Also, the Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt and indicate approval of the drawings filed May 14, 2003.

**Response to the Prior Art Rejections**

Independent claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display panel sealing apparatus having *inter alia*, a pressurizing unit with *a plurality of pressurizing actuators* for pressurizing liquid crystal display panels. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the asserted reference, Taniguchi, fails to teach, disclose, or otherwise suggest this feature.

Specifically, the Examiner asserts that this feature is disclosed in Figure 1 of Taniguchi. Applicant disagrees and respectfully submits that neither Figure 1 nor any other portion of the Taniguchi reference teaches or suggests a liquid crystal display panel sealing apparatus having a

pressurizing unit with *a plurality of pressurizing actuators* for pressurizing liquid crystal display panels.

Specifically, Taniguchi does not disclose a *plurality* of pressurizing actuators, as required by claim 1. Taniguchi, at Figure 1, discloses a single pressurizing actuator consisting of a knob-6, and a spring-5, which is capable of pressing "liquid crystal cells" within a cassette so that uniform liquid crystal layer thickness is achieved. Moreover, there is no disclosure in Taniguchi, and the Examiner cites to none, suggesting that the liquid crystal display panel sealing apparatus disclosed contains a plurality of pressurizing actuators. Taniguchi merely discloses liquid crystal cells-1 which are pressed by pressure bodies-2, when a pressurizing element consisting of a knob-6 and spring-5, is rotated, so that "a gap [within] the liquid crystal cell is corrected." The pressure bodies-2 are not pressurizing actuators. Instead, they are structures which hold the "liquid crystal cells" upon insertion into the cassette. (*See Translated Abstract of Taniguchi*).

Therefore, Taniguchi does not disclose either expressly or implicitly, a liquid crystal display panel sealing apparatus containing a plurality of pressurizing actuators and thus, claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), by the disclosure of Taniguchi. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and all rejected claims dependent thereon, specifically claims 2, 4 and 6.

Applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over the cited prior art for at least the same reason.

Additionally, even though rejected claims 2 and 4 are believed to be allowable based solely on their respective dependencies from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/772,955

Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 2 and 4 since no basis at all was provided in the office action for their rejection. Only the limitations of claim 1 were addressed. If the Examiner intends to maintain this rejection, as it applies to claims 2 and 4 in any future action, he or she is requested to provide explicit bases for the rejection on the record. Further, since no specific grounds of rejection have been asserted with respect to claims 2 and 4, any future rejection would be considered a "new ground of rejection" for purposes of a response. The same holds for claim 7 as well since no specific basis was provided for its rejection either.

Despite the fact that claim 2 is allowable at least based on its dependency from claim 1, as discussed above and, moreover, despite the fact that the Examiner failed to provide a *prima facie* rejection with respect to claim 2, Applicant submits that claim 2 recites independently patentable subject matter in regard to the cited prior art. In particular, Taniguchi does not disclose a cassette comprising a guide unit for guiding liquid crystal display panels according to the size of the LCD panel, as required by claim 2. Further, Figure 1 of Taniguchi merely discloses a cassette capable of housing "liquid crystal cells." Accordingly, Taniguchi does not teach, suggest or otherwise disclose at least this limitation of claim 2. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 2.

Notwithstanding the Examiner's failure to provide a basis for the rejection of claim 4, and despite the fact that claim 4 is patentable over the cited prior art based on its dependency from claim 1, as discussed above, Applicant submits that claim 4 recites independently patentable subject matter. In particular, since Taniguchi discloses *a single* pressurizing element,

it does not teach or otherwise suggest that *pressurizing actuators* are *dispersed radially*. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 4.

Although there was no basis for the rejection of claim 7 within the Office Action, as mentioned above, Applicant submits that independent claim 7 contains subject matter that is patentable over the disclosure of Taniguchi. In particular, independent claim 7 recites a method for sealing liquid crystal display panels comprising, *inter alia*, adjusting a cassette to be adapted to a size of LCD panels, and loading the cassette in a pressurizing unit having a plurality of pressurizing actuators. As previously pointed out in regard to claim 2, nothing in Taniguchi suggests that the cassette disclosed therein is capable of being adapted to the size of LCD panels. As such, the Taniguchi disclosure does *not* disclose, suggest or otherwise teach a method for adjusting the cassette to accommodate varying sizes of LCD panels.

Similarly, as previously discussed in regard to claim 1, Taniguchi does not disclose a pressurizing unit having a plurality of pressurizing actuators. Accordingly, the Taniguchi reference does not disclose, suggest or otherwise teach a method for loading a cassette into a pressurizing unit having a plurality of pressurizing actuators. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 7.

### **Claim Objections**

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to claims 3, and 5 since these claims depend from patentable claim 1. Similarly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 8 because it depends from patentable claim 7.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/772,955

### Patentability of New Claims

For additional claim coverage merited by the scope of the invention, Applicant has added new claims 9-13. Applicant submits that the prior art does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the combination of features contained therein.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in form for immediate allowance with claims 1-13, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to **contact the undersigned** at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 22, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin M. Barner  
Registration No. 46,075

Attorney Docket No.: Q62734